

**Agenda Item:** Item 11-6A  
**Meeting Date:** August 11 and 12, 2004

## CONSIDERATION OF A RESOLUTION ADOPTING CRITERIA FOR APPROVING PROGRAM PLANS

---

**Description:** This report provides information on the final draft criteria which will be used as a basis for reviewing and approving the Final Draft Program Plans.

**Recommended Action:** Staff recommends that the California Bay-Delta Authority adopt the attached Resolution 04-08-02 adopting criteria for reviewing and approving Program Plans.

---

### **Background**

The California Bay-Delta Authority Act of 2003 requires the Authority to annually review and approve and potentially modify Program Plans and long-term expenditure plans. The program planning process provides a forum to describe what has been accomplished, strategically plan for future implementation actions, identify problems and propose steps for resolving issues, identify available funding and additional funding needs, and ensure cross-program integration and balance.

There are two sections of the California Water Code that contain direction on the use of criteria for annual and multi-year plans. A single set of criteria are being proposed for the review, approval, and modification of integrated annual and multi-year program plans and expenditure plans. These criteria include those specified in Section 79423 (i) and additional criteria based on those included in the Record of Decision (ROD).

Draft Criteria were distributed to the Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC) and the Authority at the May and June meetings, respectively. The criteria have been revised based on the comments staff received from both BDPAC and the Authority. Adjustments were also made to make it easier to apply the criteria to each individual Program Plan, as well as to the Program Plans as a group.

One of the challenges faced this year by the implementing agencies was that the proposed criteria were developed concurrently with the plans themselves. As a result, the plans were not prepared to specifically respond to the criteria, and may not specifically address every criterion this year. Next year the criteria will be provided with the instructions for preparing the plans, so that the plans can be more responsive to and consistent with the criteria.

The final draft criteria are provided in Attachment 1. Attachment 1 also includes additional explanation of the context or reasoning behind each criterion and guiding questions that will be used by the implementing agencies in the development of next year's Program Plans.

**List of Attachments**

Attachment 1 – Final Draft Criteria for Approval of Program Plans  
Resolution 04-08-02

**Contact**

Wendy Halverson Martin  
Chief Deputy Director

Phone: (916) 445-5511

## **DRAFT CRITERIA FOR REVIEW, APPROVAL, AND MODIFICATION OF PROGRAM PLANS AND EXPENDITURE PLANS**

### **1. Previous year's activities:**

*Criterion:* The Program Plan adequately addresses and evaluates the progress of previous year's activities and accomplishments.

*Context:* This criterion is intended to make sure that the Program Plans are responsive to issues associated with balance, and address performance and funding gaps identified in the previous year's annual report.

*Guiding Questions:* Consider the major activities from last year's plan and compare with this year's accomplishments. Is the progress of the activities consistent with what was proposed in the Program Plan? Discuss which, if any, activities were not completed and why. Are all major activities and accomplishments listed? Do the major activities address the gaps identified in the annual report?

### **2. Performance:**

*Criterion:* The Program Plan demonstrates adequate progress towards meeting the objectives of the program element and the Record of Decision (ROD), and the development of performance measures for each program element.

*Context:* Each program element needs to be able to evaluate progress in achieving the goals and objectives in the ROD and include activities, which will advance the program element. Performance measures provide a consistent method of measuring progress at different scales.

*Guiding Questions:* Does the Program Plan include activities which advance the program element and help achieve the goals and objectives in the ROD? Does the Program Plan describe progress toward the development of three levels of performance assessment as outlined in the prototype performance measures developed for the CALFED program?

### **3. Funding:**

*Criterion:* The Program Plan clearly describes projected program expenditures, funding gaps, and priorities for funding.

*Context:* This criterion is intended to ensure that major activities identified in the Program Plan are funded. Program Plans should describe where funds will be spent and what is the projected funding amount needed for the program. Furthermore, depending on the amount of money available, priorities for funding should be clearly articulated.

*Guiding Questions:* Do the Program Plans include charts that identify approved funding? In the accomplishments section do the Program Plans discuss why they were able/not able to accomplish certain activities with the funding available and discuss how that affects the schedule of activities?

#### **4. Consistency with the ROD:**

*Criterion:* The Program Plan is consistent with the goals and objectives of the ROD including the implementation commitments contained in the ROD.

*Context:* This criterion is intended to make sure Program Plan activities are consistent with, and help achieve the goals and objectives of the ROD including the implementation commitments contained in the ROD (pages 32-35). The Science, Environmental Justice, and Tribal Relations commitments have their own section in the Program Plan to highlight these specific activities. The rest of the implementation commitments are described throughout the Program Plan.

*Guiding Questions:* Is there a description of progress towards revising targets or discussion of new targets and process for revision? Does the Program Plan describe major activities and accomplishments undertaken for Environmental Justice and Tribal Relations and outline a plan with activities for the following years? In addition, are local leadership, working landscapes and any other implementation commitments, where applicable, included throughout the Program Plan?

#### **5. Multiple Objectives:**

*Criterion:* The Program Plan is adequately integrated with other program elements, and will result in implementation of projects or programs that meet the objectives of multiple programs.

*Context:* This criterion is intended to ensure the Program Plans implement activities that result in progress towards achieving the cross-program goals and objectives contained in the ROD. Activities should be implemented in a manner that coordinates and integrates with other program elements.

*Guiding Questions:* Does the plan contain activities and accomplishments that will result in progress towards achieving the cross-program goals and objectives contained in the ROD? Are cooperation and coordination described and summarized between the program and the other program elements?

#### **6. Integrating Science:**

*Criterion:* The Program Plan effectively incorporates science and peer review processes into program activities.

*Context:* This criterion is intended to make sure the Program Plans use science to help plan and evaluate their CALFED activities and decision making.

*Guiding Questions:* Does the Science section contain information on the following: critical unknowns, adaptive management practices, advisory panels and science advisors, peer review process, issues being addressed by studies, and research being conducted? Is there a description of how the implementing agencies use science to guide implementation of CALFED activities and inform decision-making?

## **7. Public and Stakeholder Involvement:**

*Criterion:* The Program Plan provides for extensive public involvement and participation through a transparent process, including the Bay-Delta Public Advisory Committee (BDPAC) and its subcommittees and the public.

*Context:* This criterion is intended to address the issue of public comment and stakeholder involvement described in the implementation commitments of the ROD. CALFED is committed to providing a transparent decision making process for programs and activities.

*Guiding Questions:* Does the Program Plan identify opportunities for public involvement associated with the implementation of Program activities. Were the Program Plans developed with the assistance of the appropriate BDPAC subcommittees? Were they discussed in BDPAC and at the Authority?

## **8. Balance and Integration:**

*Criterion:* The 11 Program Plans, when considered together, are likely to result in balanced implementation, as described in Section 79402 (b) of the California Bay-Delta Authority Act, for ecosystem quality, water supply reliability, water quality and levee system integrity.

*Context:* This criterion is intended to address any potential gaps in balance and program integration. The 11 Program Plans together should overall provide for balance in the program and be integrated to the maximum extent possible to achieve the goals and objectives in the ROD.

*Guiding Questions:* Do the Program Plans address performance and funding gaps to ensure balance and integration? Is the Program Plan responsive to any deficiencies or issues associated with balance, which were identified as a whole? Does the Program move forward consistently with the ROD based on the activities discussed in the Program Plans?

**CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA AUTHORITY  
RESOLUTION 04-08-02****ADOPTING CRITERIA FOR APPROVING PROGRAM PLANS**

**WHEREAS**, Section 79421(o) of the California Water Code requires the California Bay-Delta Authority to adopt criteria for review, approval, and modification of the annual Program Plans; and

**WHEREAS**, Section 79423 (i) of the California Water Code requires the Authority to review and approve, and, as appropriate, authorizes it to recommend that implementing agencies modify, multi-year program plans and long-term expenditure plans on behalf of Category A programs, based on the following criteria: (1) consistency with the program; and (2) the balanced achievement of the program's goals and objectives; and

**WHEREAS**, the plans prepared by the Authority and the implementing agencies include both multi-year and annual program plans and expenditure plans; and

**WHEREAS**, the criteria submitted to the Authority are consistent with the mandate of the California Bay-Delta Authority Act of 2003 and address both annual and multi-year program plans and expenditure plans;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Authority adopts the criteria presented and directs staff to forward the approved criteria to the Legislature as required in Section 79421 (o) of the California Water Code.

**CERTIFICATION**

The undersigned Assistant to the California Bay-Delta Authority does hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true, and correct copy of a resolution duly and regularly adopted at a meeting of the California Bay-Delta Authority held on August 11 and 12, 2004

**Dated:** \_\_\_\_\_

---

**Heidi Rooks**  
**Assistant to the California Bay-Delta Authority**